



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/667,021

09/18/2003

Robert Moss

03-0172

9135

24319

7590

10/27/2008

LSI CORPORATION
1621 BARBER LANE
MS: D-105
MILPITAS, CA 95035

EXAMINER

SHIFERAW, ELENI A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2436

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/27/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/667,021	MOSS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ELENI A. SHIFERAW	2436	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ELENI A. SHIFERAW. (3)_____.

(2) Daniel Fisherman. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 21 October 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: 5357572, and 5278903.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner fully considers the applicant's arguments faxed to the examiner. The examiner consulted 101 panel, updated search on class subclass 714/726, 714/733, 714/724 and 714/727-729, and updated PLUS search on October 21, 2008.

The 101 panel approves the examiner's 101 rejection as being proper. The "a scan test signal interceptor", "a security element", "means for detecting scan test operation", and "means for precluding retrieval of secure information" recited in claims 1 and as means for function in claim 13 are interpreted as logic/software/"scan test control logic", in light of the applicant's disclosure page 7-8. The examiner asked the attorney what hardware element is recited in the claim(s) or where in the disclosure the "a scan test signal interceptor", "a security element", "means for detecting scan test operation", and "means for precluding retrieval of secure information" are defined/described as a hardware, the attorney answered "the whole claim and the whole specification is hardware". The applicant's opinion regarding "the Examiner's Computer Science background (as distinct from an Electrical Engineering background) explains such a gross misinterpretation...", applicant's interview summary 10/9/08, is noticed, but the office still approves the 101 rejection as being proper and/or an apparatus claim comprising software features is not patentable under 35 U.S.C. 101. The examiner suggested including a chip/"secure scan control" in the claim language to perform the features of a scan test signal interceptor, security element and ... since the chip/"secure scan control 250" is intercepting signals and precluding retrieval of secure information within the integrated circuit 200 (see fig. 2 of the applicant's disclosure).

The examiner disagrees with the art rejection arguments.

In response to the applicant's arguments against the references individually (Matsui reference being unrelated and has no relevance with the claimed invention which recites structures and method relating to scan test of an integrated circuit), one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding argument the references failure to teach the recited erasure/reset/clear all, argument is not persuasive because Bianco et al. discloses address and/or PROM erasure that contain each sensitive subcircuit see col. 6 lines 10-31, col. 5 lines 19-36 and col. 4 lines 7-28. However upon applicant's previous argument the examiner combined Matsui et al. to show erasing secure information/identification was well-known at the time of the invention was made see col. 3 lines 54-61 of Matsui et al. that discloses identification information delete unit deleting identification information when a read scan signal is detected.

In updating the search, the Examiner finds and provides reference US 7185249 B2 to the applicant during the interview by pointing out the abstract, fig. 1 element 120, fig. 2 element 230, col. 2 lines 37-65, col. 3 lines 4-16, col. 4 lines 25-65 and col. 5 lines 28-54 that discloses a processor comprising scan controller 120 that intercepts scan test signal and CLEARS AND RESETS secure information like identification keys, algorithms, sensitive information, secure key and etc.

The applicant agrees that this reference is so close to the invention and agrees to discuss to his client and amend the claims to overcome reference 7185249.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Eleni A Shiferaw/
Examiner, Art Unit 2436

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements**Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record**

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews
Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.